

1 **Miscellaneous**

2 **Q. Let's turn to the seventh section of your testimony. What other issues would you like**
3 **to address?**

4 A. I would like to briefly discuss some problems associated with Verizon's line splitter
5 proposal, and its proposal for collocation in remote terminals. The fact that my comments
6 are narrowly focused on a few specific issues should not be interpreted as an indication
7 that these are the only problems with these Verizon proposals.
8

9 *Line Splitters*
10

11 **Q. What aspect of the line splitter proposal do you want to discuss?**

12 A. Although Verizon has not filed a proposed tariff for line splitting, its service description
13 includes some language which might be interpreted as indicating that line splitting will be
14 limited to lines over which Verizon is providing voice services. In its line splitter service
15 description, Verizon references the FCC's unbundling rules, which provide in part:

16
17 An incumbent LEC shall only provide a requesting carrier with access to
18 the high frequency portion of the loop if the incumbent LEC is providing,
19 and continues to provide, analog circuit-switched voiceband services on
20 the particular loop for which the requesting carrier seeks access. [FCC
21 Rules, §51.319(h)(3)].
22

23 The referenced FCC rules only address when and under what circumstances an
24 incumbent is required to provide access to the high frequency portion of its loops. In this
25 context, Rule §51.319(h)(3) is appropriate. An incumbent cannot be required to make a
26 portion of a loop available, if another carrier is already renting the entire loop. Since the
27 CLEC is paying the full cost of the loop, it logically "owns" the rights to the high
28 frequency portion, and Verizon is not in a position to sell this portion to another carrier.

29 This rule does not address situations where a CLEC is renting a loop and wants to
30 use a splitter in conjunction with that loop, so that it can provide both xDSL service and
31 ordinary voice service to its customer. In this context, line splitting should be available to
32 the CLEC, regardless of how it is using the loop. In other words, if a CLEC is providing
33 voice services over a rented a loop (including via UNE-P and EELs), it should have the
34 option of also using the loop to provide data services to its customer. For that matter, the

1 CLEC should have the option of renting the high frequency portion of the loop to another
2 CLEC, if it so chooses. Otherwise, CLECs would be prevented from gaining the full
3 economic benefit of the loops they are renting, and incumbents, who currently have the
4 ability to provide both voice and data services over the same line, would enjoy a
5 competitive advantage over competing carriers, who would be limited to one type of
6 service or the other on any particular loop. Without line splitting, CLECs will be forced
7 to rent additional loops to accommodate customers that want both voice and data service.

8 The Commission should make it clear that line splitting is available to CLECs for
9 use in conjunction with loops that are rented from Verizon, including loops that are
10 rented pursuant to a UNE-P or EEL arrangement. To the extent data carriers are allowed
11 to install splitters under a variety of different arrangements (e.g. within their own
12 collocation space, or adjacent to Verizon's main distribution frame pursuant to a virtual
13 collocation arrangement) the same options should be available to CLECs renting loops
14 under a UNE-P or EEL arrangement. For example, CLECs should be allowed to insert
15 splitters into their EELs using a virtual collocation arrangement, thereby minimizing the
16 risk of service disruption, and avoiding unnecessary expense.

17
18 *Remote Terminal Collocation-Assessment of DC Power Charges*
19

20 **Q. What is your concern with reference to Verizon's remote terminal collocation**
21 **proposal?**

22 A. The potential exists for a significant mismatch between the way in which Verizon
23 proposes to charge for power, and the way in which power costs are actually incurred.
24 Verizon's proposed tariff for collocation at remote terminal enclosures ("CRTEE")
25 provides as follows: "The DC power rate, as set forth in Section J.1. following, will apply
26 for both physical and virtual CRTEE arrangements". [Tariff 218, Section 2, Sheet 54A].
27 With regard to power, Section J.1. cross references another tariff provision, which
28 provides that the recurring monthly power charge will be applied on a "per amp, per feed
29 fused" basis. [Id., Sheet 55] It is not clear whether Verizon is proposing to charge based
30 upon the size of the electrical load (actual number of amps) or the size of the fuse which
31 is used to provide protection to the load. The fuse size could be significantly larger than
32 the actual load. CLECs should pay for the amount of power they actually use, not the
33 nominal maximum capacity of a circuit, as measured by the fuse that is installed.

1 It is not uncommon to install a fuse that is greater than the anticipated load. For
2 example, your house may have a 30 amp circuit which provides electricity to a few lights
3 and some small appliances, drawing a total of less than 20 amps. Similarly, if a CLEC
4 collocates a piece of equipment with a 20 amp load, Verizon may install a 30 amp fuse on
5 the circuit it provides to serve that load. If Verizon were to charge CLECs based upon
6 fuse size, rather than capacity of the installed equipment, the CLEC may be required to
7 pay for more power than it actually needs or uses.

8 Similarly, the language stating that charges are applied “per feed” is ambiguous,
9 and this ambiguity could lead to overcharging of CLECs. Extra feeds are sometimes
10 installed to provide redundancy in the electrical supply provided to a piece of
11 telecommunications equipment. When this is done, the CLEC does not use twice as
12 much power; it merely receives more reliable power. If Verizon were to charge twice as
13 much when redundant feeds are provided, a CLEC could be required to pay more than
14 the actual cost of supplying power to the collocated equipment. Consider the following
15 example: A CLEC collocates a piece of equipment with a maximum load of 20 amps.
16 Verizon runs two feeds to the equipment, each with a 30 amp fuse. Depending upon how
17 one interpret’s Verizon’s proposal, the CLEC could potentially be asked to pay for 60
18 amps of power, which is far more than it could ever use.

19 The Commission should clarify that Verizon can only charge for the actual power
20 used by CLECs, as determined by the collocated equipment. Alternatively, a meter could
21 be installed to measure the amount of power utilized by the CLEC, and the CLEC would
22 thereby be charged based upon the actual amount of power it consumes. Power charges
23 should not be a linear function of the number of feeds run by Verizon, nor should such
24 charges be assessed based on the size of the fuse which is used to protect the circuit.